

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 18, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 7 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 7 and 15-17 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. It is noted that the amendments were made to merely correct minor informalities with the claim language and they do not affect the scope of the claims.

The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,217,704 to *Anetsberger* (hereinafter “*Anetsberger*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Anetsberger* does not teach every element recited in claim 7 and therefore cannot anticipate this claim. More specifically, claim 7 recites a clothes dryer which includes, among other features, “one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside the clothes dryer, the one or more holes being provided at a bottom portion of the clothes dryer.” *Anetsberger* fails to disclose this feature.

The Office Action alleges that *Anetsberger* teaches a dryer 24 capable of drying clothes. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Anetsberger* teaches a deep fat fryer. A deep fat fryer is not capable of drying clothes. Thus, *Anetsberger*, cannot possibly teach “one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside *the clothes dryer*, the one or more holes being provided at a bottom portion of *the clothes dryer*,” as required by claim 7.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over *Anetsberger*, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 7 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB Patent No. 2,090,398 to *Ros* (hereinafter “*Ros*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Ros* does not teach every element recited in claims 7 and 15-17 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 7 recites a clothes dryer which includes, among other features, “one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside the clothes dryer, the one or more holes being provided at a bottom portion of the clothes dryer, adjacent only to the inlet.” *Ros* fails to disclose these features.

First, the Office Action alleges that *Ros* teaches a dryer 24 capable for drying clothes. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Ros* teaches a domestic gas heater. A gas heater is not a clothes dryer. Thus, *Anetsberger*, cannot possibly teach “one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside *the clothes dryer*, the one or more holes being provided at a bottom portion of *the clothes dryer*,” as required by claim 7.

Further, *Ros* fails to explicitly disclose a mixing pipe. Thus, it would be impossible for one of ordinary skill to determine, from the face of *Ros*, whether *Ros* teaches “one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe.”

In addition, the plurality of holes 15, 19 and 20 taught by *Ros* are located at various locations in the body components 2 and 3. Therefore, *Ros* cannot possibly teach one or more holes located “adjacent only to the inlet,” as required by the claim.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over *Ros*, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 19 and 20, which depend from claim 7 are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 7 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA") in view of *Ros*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicant submits that neither AAPA nor *Ros*, singularly or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element recited in claims 1-3, 7 and 15-17. In particular, claim 1 recites a clothes dryer which includes, among other features, "a plurality of air hole in a bottom of a base adjacent only to an inlet side of a mixing pipe...the position of the air holes is such that the primary air flows through the air holes and is focused in a region immediately surrounding the mixing pipe." Claim 7 recites a clothes dryer which includes, among other features, "one or more holes configured to allow the air to directly flow into the mixing pipe from outside the clothes dryer, the one or more holes being provided at a bottom portion of the clothes dryer, adjacent only to the inlet." Neither of the references either singularly or in combination, disclose these features.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, AAPA does not disclose "a plurality of air holes in a bottom of a base adjacent only an inlet side of a mixing pipe." *See page 4 of the Office Action.* *Ros* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of AAPA. However, as shown above, *Ros* fails to teach or suggest a clothes dryer and, more importantly, it fails to teach or suggest holes "only to an inlet side of a mixing pipe." Thus, *Ros* cannot possibly teach "the position of the air holes is such that the primary air flows through the air holes and is focused in a region immediately surrounding the mixing pipe." Because neither of the references, singularly or in combination teaches all the claimed elements, the teaching of AAPA in view of *Ros* does not render the invention obvious.

Therefore, for at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over AAPA in view of *Ros* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2, 3 and 15-17, which variously depend from claims 1 and 7 are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Mark R. Kresloff (Reg. No. 46,522)
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant